DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 046 CG 024 061

AUTHOR Guinee, James P.; Tracey, Terence J.
TITLE Examining Some Crucial Variables in Counselor Interpersonal Power Base Preference.
PUB DATE Aug 91
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (99th, San Francisco, CA, August 16-20, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Counselor Client Relationship; *Counselors; Counselor Training; Credibility; Higher Education; *Influences; Interpersonal Relationship; *Power Structure; Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

According to Strong and Matross (1973), a counselor's main sources of influencing the client's behavior are expert, referent, and legitimate power bases. To date, the only studies examining the differential preference of counselors for interpersonal power bases have focused on preference as a function of counselor gender, counselor level of experience, and client problem. However, the literature is equivocal with respect to these results, and it is stated that the design and methodology of these studies has been relatively poor. This study re-examined differential counselor preference of power bases as a function of gender, experience, and client problem, with a different methodology. A questionnaire using client scenarios and multiple indicators of power base preference was developed for this study. Responses from 40 students (11 males, 29 females; 31 White, 4 African-American, 1 Mexican American, 1 Asian American, and 3 foreign born) in a counseling psychology program to the questionnaire were examined. Results of the study indicated that counselors did not vary in their endorsement of the different power bases as a function of gender or level of experience; however, there was support for differential usage of the power bases depending upon the specific client being used as a stimulus. Regardless of how experience level is defined, there was no relation with power base endorsement. (LLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Examining Some Crucial Variables in Counselor Interpersonal Power Base Preference

James P. Guinee and Terence J. Tracey
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, August, 1991, San Fransisco.

ED343048

Abstract

According to Strong and Matross (1973), a counselor's main sources of influencing the client's behavior are expert, referent, and legitimate power bases. To date, the only studies examining the differential preference of counselors for interpersonal power bases have focused on preference as a function of counselor gender, counselor level of experience, and client problem (Robyak, 1981; Robyak, Goodyear, Prange, & Donham, 1986). However, the literature is equivocal with respect to these results; further, the design and methodology of these studies has been relatively poor. Thus, the purpose of this study was to re-examine differential counselor preference of power bases as a function of gender, experience, and client problem, and to do so with an improved methodology. A questionnaire using client scenarios and multiple indicators of power base preference was developed for this study. Responses from forty students in a counseling psychology program to the questionnaire were examined. Results demonstrate significant effects for client problem type, but not for counselor experience nor counselor gender. Implications for these findings are discussed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CG024061

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James P. Guinee

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Examining Some Crucial Variables in Counselor Interpersonal Power Base Preference

According to Strong and Matross (1973), a counselor's main sources of influencing the client's behaviors are expert, referent, and legitimate power bases. Strong and Matross contend that developing and appropriately using power bases are essential, as influence attempts are successful only if the client perceives the counselor as having resources relevant to their specific needs. Thus it is important for counselors to be skilled in the usage of these different power bases. However there has been relatively little research in counselors' ability to use and preference for differential usage of these power bases.

Robyak (1981) contends that although the factors that determine counselor preference for power bases has largely been ignored in the literature, it can be argued that counselors in training develop (through trial and error) a stable yet individualistic sense of the ways each power base works with each particular client. Thus, preferences may emerge that characterize the counselor's influence style, and this may subsequently affect the counselor's future choice of influence methods. Thus, it would seem important to examine different factors that may account for a counselor's development of power base preference, specifically through the course of training.

The only studies done in this area have been by Robyak (Robyak, 1981; Robyak, Goodyear, Prange, & Donham, 1986) and have examined endorsement of these three power bases in a paper and pencil format. It was hypothesized that power base preference would be related to counselor gender and experience level. Specifically, it was argued that female counselors would be more likely to prefer the legitimate power base (i.e., genuineness, sincerity and warmth), while male counselors would prefer the expert power base (i.e., knowledgeability, rationality and confidence), in keeping with sex role differences. Robyak (1981) found support for this gender difference but it was not replicated in the Robyak et al. (1986) study. This lack of replication was attributed to changes in perceptions of gender-related interpersonal behavior during the intervening years.

Robyak et al. (1986) hypothesized that power base preference would also be related to training level, with more novice counselors

preferring the expert power base less than the other power bases as they may be less prone to perceive themselves as expert and thus may have difficulty adopting this power base. The results of Robyak et al. support this hypothesis indicating that the expert power base is a difficult one for novice counselors to use and that with more experience, they feel more comfortable with it.

The other variable examined by Robyak et al. with respect to power base preference was client problem type. Given that Strong and Matross (1973) view it as important to adopt different power bases depending upon the specific client, the ability of counselors to adopt different power bases across different client problems was assessed; specifically, if presented with a description of a depressed client and an anxious client, would counselors prefer different power bases. However, they found no difference in power base preference across the different types of clients.

In sum, the studies of Robyak present an interesting yet far from clear picture regarding the preference of power bases. One of the problems with the research is with the definition and assessment of power base preference. Both Robyak studies had the subjects read a paragraph describing each of the 3 power bases, and then the subject would indicate on a single item the extent to which they would use each power base. Beyond the issue of the unreliability of 1 item scales, having subjects respond to a whole paragraph containing many concepts yields little information on what the basis of the single item rating indicates. Given the psychometric problems of measuring the power bases in this way and the importance of the concept of power base utilization, we thought it important to reexamine the questions posed by Robyak except using a more sound assessment instrument.

We designed an instrument to assess likelihood of endorsement of specific behaviors representing the three power bases. This focus on specific behaviors and not ambiguous, unreliable general descriptions was thought to be an improvement over the past research and hopefully more generalizable to actual counseling as specific behaviors are of concern and not general approaches. The endorsement of specific behaviors representing the three power bases were examined as they varied across the same variables examined by Robyak (Robyak, 1981; Robyak et al., 1986): counselor gender, counselor experience level, and client problem type. The major departure in this study from that of Robyak (besides more

psychometrically sound measures) was the specific client problem types examined. Whereas Robyak et al. (1986) looked for differences between the relatively similar client problem types of anxiety and depression, we chose more divergent client problems of career indecision and suicidal ideation. As demonstrated by Tracey, Hays, Malone, and Herman (1988), with more severely disturbed clients, trainees respond more similarly than they do with less disturbed clients. Thus, whether or not there would be more differential power base preferences for the more disturbed client was examined.

Lastly, we decided to have participants complete the CRF-S (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975), an instrument that measures the same constructs as the three power bases proposed by Strong and Matross (1973) -- counselor expertness, referentness, and legitimacy. Typically, the CRF-S is completed by clients in evaluating their counselors, and has been found to measure not three constructs but one -- a more global "good guy" factor (Tracey, Glidden & Kokotovic, 1988). However, we felt that trainees, in evaluating their own behavior, might be more sensitive to differences between their usage of these methods of influence in counseling; whereas clients may not make these subtle but important distinctions. Moreover, we wondered if correlating participants' responses on the CRF-S -- general traits-- and the specific situational power base behaviors assessed in this study would yield a high degree of correspondence, in that a counselor's self-assessment of their general trait usage and situational behavior usage should bear at least a moderate relationship.

Method

Sample

Forty students enrolled in an APA approved counseling psychology program at a large midwestern University comprised the sample. This group included 11 males and 29 females. Twenty-three students were classified as "less experienced" (0-2 completed semesters of supervised practicum experience) and 17 students were classified as "more advanced" (beyond 2 completed semesters of supervised practicum experience up to and including internship experience). With respect to racial breakdown, there were 31 whites, 4 African-Americans, 1 Mexican-American, 1 Asian-American, and 3 foreign-born students.

Instruments

Power Base Assessment (PBA) was designed for use in this study and was used to assess counselor preference for the three different power bases (expert, legitimate, and trustworthy) in response to specific client characteristics. The instrument consisted of a client description followed by 15 counselor statements that could be uttered to the client, each representing one of the three power bases. The counselor was requested to endorse, using a seven point scale (1 = very unlikely to use, 7 = very likely to use) the likelihood that he or she would use that response in interacting with the client described. Three separate summed subscales scores of five items each were yielded representing the likelihood of usage of the three power bases.

The specific items included in the PBA were selected after distributing an earlier version of the PBA containing 30 items to 8 first-year counseling psychology graduate students. These students were not included in the actual study's sample. The students were given descriptions of the separate power bases and asked to rate each item on a seven point scale (1=not at all, to 7=very much) for the extent to which each item reflected each of the power bases. For each power base, the items were ranked in terms of discriminating how representative the item was for a particular power base (over the two other power bases). The items chosen typically contained a mean rating for one power base between 5.0 and 7.0, with the mean rating of the other two power bases below 4.0. Thus the 5 best discriminating items for each separate power base were chosen; 15 items were chosen in all.

There were two separate client descriptions used as stimuli in guiding counselor responses on the PBA. The two client descriptions were identical in describing a college female who was coming into a counseling center; the only difference was the distress reflected in the presenting problem. One client was described as having suicidal ideation, while the other was concerned with career indecisiveness. All other aspects of the descriptions were identical. Respondents were instructed to read the client description and imagine meeting with this client in the middle stages of counseling when responding to the PBA items.

On the current sample of 40, internal consistencies were calculated for each of the three PBA scales across the two separate client descriptions. For the career indecision client, alpha's of .73, .53, and .56 were obtained for the expert, referent, and legitimate subscales, respectively. For the suicidal ideation client, alphas of .54, .48, and .57 were obtained for the same three respective subscales.

Counselor Rating Form-Short (CRF-S, Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983) is a shortened version of the CRF (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975) and consists of 12 adjectives assessing perception of the counselor which are responded to using a 7 point format. The CRF-S yields subscale scores for the three power bases of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Corrigan and Schmidt have demonstrated sound reliability and validity for the instrument . However, Tracey, Glidden and Kokotovic (1988) have demonstrated that though the CRF-S assesses the unique aspects of the three power bases, it predominantly is indicative of a general positive evaluation.

The CRF-S is typically used to assess client reactions to counselor power bases, however as used in this study, the CRF-S was used to obtain a self assessment of the counselor of his or her characteristic power base utilization. Thus the CRF-S was used to get an indication of general stable self perceptions of power base utilization, unlike the client specific power base utilization assessed above.

Procedures

Questionnaire packets containing a cover letter describing the research, the CRF-S, and the two PBA's (one with each client description presented in random order) were mailed to 56 students enrolled in an APA approved counseling psychology program in the midwest. The respondents were all assured that their cooperation was voluntary and that their responses would be anonymous. Forty-three students returned the materials for a 77% response rate.

As a check on the validity of the responses, two items were included in the PBA, one requesting that the respondent report the presenting problem of the stimulus client and one requesting that the respondents rate (on a 7 point scale from not very well to very well) the extent to which they could place themselves in the counselor role for the task. Three respondents reported presenting problems different from those listed in the stimulus and were thus

discarded, resulting in a final sample of 40. The mean for the item regarding ability to place oneself in the role of the counselor was 4.95 (SD= 1.01), indicating that the final sample of 40 respondents perceived themselves as appropriately in role during the task.

Results

A three-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was employed to examine differences in the PBA subscales across level of experience, gender, and presenting problem, with experience level and gender being between subject factors and problem type being a within subject factor. The means and standard deviations for each of the PBA subscale scores across the conditions are reported in Table 1 and the results of the MANOVA are summarized in Table 2.

Insert Table 1 About Here

Insert Table 2 About Here

The results of the MANOVA were not significant for gender, level of experience, nor any of the interactions. Only the within subjects factor of problem type was found to attain significance. Post-hoc ANOVA's on the problem type effect were found to be significant for the expert ($F(1,38)= 7.20$, $p<.01$) and the legitimate ($F(1,38)= 7.84$, $p<.01$) power base subscales but not for the referent subscale ($F(1,38)= 0.34$, $p>.05$). Trainees demonstrated a greater utilization of the expert power base with the career indecision client than with the suicidal client, while the opposite pattern was true for the legitimate power base.

Given that level of experience is often a difficult concept to operationalize (Stein & Lambert, 1984), two other methods of dichotomizing the sample along experience lines were examined to ensure that the lack of difference associated with experience was accurate and not necessarily reflective of the specific manner of dividing the sample. The first method used was to dichotomize the

sample using highest degree obtained (bachelor's versus master's). The distinction is the same method used by Robyak et al. (1986). The second method was to dichotomize the sample using the 150 direct client contact hours as a cutoff. This cutoff was selected as it is the minimum requirement necessary in applying for internship. The results of the MANOVA's conducted using these two alternative definitions of experience were identical to the one listed above. The PBA scores were not related to level of experience, however defined, singly or in interaction with the other variables.

Insert Table 3 About Here

Finally, to examine the extent to which situational endorsement of power base usage is similar to general endorsement of one's own style of power base usage, the PBA subscales across the two client stimuli were correlated with the CRF-S. These correlations are listed in Table 3. Even though a liberal individual alpha test of .05 is used, none of the correlations listed in Table 3 attained significance, indicating that there was no relation between specific power base responses given to specific clients and perceived global power base traits as assessed by the CRF-S.

Discussion

The results of the study indicate that counselors did not vary in their endorsement of the different power bases as a function of gender or level of experience, however there was support for differential usage of the power bases depending upon the specific client being used as a stimulus. The lack of a gender effect in this study and that in Robyak et al. (1986) lead us to question the value of gender in the endorsement of power bases. Further, the present study suggests that regardless of how experience level is defined (three fairly different methods were used) there was no relation with power base endorsement. This result conflicts with the differences found by Robyak et al. (1986). However given the focus in this study on specific behaviors and on a less ambiguous and more reliable measure, we think more faith should be placed in these results. There does not appear to be a relation of experience level

(at least as it varies within graduate training) and power base endorsement.

The differential power base endorsement across problem type is important and is supportive of the theory proposed by Strong and Matross. They claim that for counselors to be effective, they must vary power base usage in accordance with a client's tacit and differential preference for these three power bases. Thus differential application of power bases is necessary. Given the two very different clients described in this study (one concerned with career indecisiveness and the other with suicide), the counselors demonstrated strong differential preferences for the expert and legitimate power bases. The legitimate power base was endorsed more with the suicidal client than with the career indecision client, while the opposite pattern was demonstrated for the expert power base; lower levels were endorsed for the suicidal client and higher levels for the career indecision. Two possible interpretations of this differential result suggest themselves. One may be that given the potential consequences of suicidal ideation, counselors-in-training may be more wary to adopt an expert power base. Another is that counselors view the expert power base as more appropriate and effective with someone with career indecision; while the legitimate power base may seem less appropriate for career clients and extremely appropriate for suicidal clients.

The lack of relation between the specific power base behaviors assessed by the PBA and the more general, global self evaluation of power bases as approximated by using the CRF-S indicates that general endorsement may have little to do with what power bases one actually are used. This result calls into question the validity the results of Robyak (1981) and Robyak et al. (1986) as they relied on very global assessments of power base. Further, given the focus on specific power base behaviors, we hope that the translation to actual in session behavior may be better. The PBA, constructed for this study, may serve as a useful instrument for future studies examining counselor differential power base preference.

This study is an analogue study using a paper and pencil format and subsequent research must be conducted on examining the generalizability of these results to actual counseling. However the differential usage of power bases across problem type is an important result, supportive of Strong and Matross' (1973) theory. More work in the area of differential responsiveness using power

bases to different clients is needed. As the differential usage is further understood, the effectiveness of this differential usage can be examined.

References

Barak, A., & LaCrosse, N. E. (1975). Multidimensional perception of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 471-476.

Corrigan, J. D., & Schmidt, L. A. (1983). Development and validation of revisions in the Counselor Rating Form. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 64-74.

Robyak, J. E. (1981). Effects of gender on the counselor's preference for methods of influence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 7-12.

Robyak, J. E., Goodyear, R. K., Prange, M. E., & Donham, G. (1986). Effects of gender, supervision, and presenting problems on practicum students' preference for interpersonal power bases. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33, 159-163.

Stein, D. M., & Lambert, M. J. (1984). On the relationship between therapist experience and psychotherapy outcome. Clinical Psychology Review, 4, 127-142.

Strong, S. R., & Matross, R. P. (1973). Change processes in counseling and psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, 25-32.

Tracey, T. J., Glidden, C. E., & Kokotovic, A. M. (1988). Factor structure of the Counselor Rating Form-Short. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35, 330-335.

Tracey, T. J., Hays, K. A., Malone, J., & Herman, B. (1988). Changes in counselor response as a function of experience. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35, 119-126.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for PBA Subscales

		Expert		Referent		Legitimate	
Variable	N	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Level of Experience							
Less Exp'd	23	18.65	4.71	14.20	3.88	21.70	3.78
More Adv'd	17	19.71	6.00	14.41	4.77	22.47	6.38
Gender							
Males	11	19.27	4.68	15.14	3.59	20.77	4.44
Females	29	19.03	5.54	13.97	4.47	22.50	5.19
Client Problem							
Career Indec.	40	20.65	5.53	14.00	4.44	20.50	4.74
Suic. Ideation	40	17.55	4.60	14.57	4.09	23.55	4.90

Table 2

Summary of the MANOVA on PBA Subscales as a Function of Gender, Experience, and Problem Type.

Source	df	MS	F	p
Level of Experience (A)	3,79	77.75	1.92	.17
Problem Type (B)	2,160	826.11	53.33	.00
Gender (C)	3,79	0.02	0.00	.98
A x B	6,79	7.59	0.49	.61
A x C	6,79	86.60	2.14	.15
B x C	6,79	32.95	2.13	.12
A x B x C	9,79	4.78	0.31	.74

Table 3

Correlations between PBA Subscales and CRF-S Subscales

	CRF-S Subscale		
PBA Subscale	Expertness	Attractiveness	Trustworthiness
Career Indecision			
Expert	.28	.22	.26
Referent	-.11	.27	.01
Legitimate	-.01	.04	.27
Suicidal Ideation			
Expert	.09	.14	.20
Referent	-.16	.16	.00
Legitimate	.08	-.20	.01

Examining Some Crucial Variables in Counselor Interpersonal Power Base Preference

James P. Guinee and Terence J. Tracey
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, August, 1991, San Fransisco.

Abstract

According to Strong and Matross (1973), a counselor's main sources of influencing the client's behavior are expert, referent, and legitimate power bases. To date, the only studies examining the differential preference of counselors for interpersonal power bases have focused on preference as a function of counselor gender, counselor level of experience, and client problem (Robyak, 1981; Robyak, Goodyear, Prange, & Donham, 1986). However, the literature is equivocal with respect to these results; further, the design and methodology of these studies has been relatively poor. Thus, the purpose of this study was to re-examine differential counselor preference of power bases as a function of gender, experience, and client problem, and to do so with an improved methodology. A questionnaire using client scenarios and multiple indicators of power base preference was developed for this study. Responses from forty students in a counseling psychology program to the questionnaire were examined. Results demonstrate significant effects for client problem type, but not for counselor experience nor counselor gender. Implications for these findings are discussed.

Examining Some Crucial Variables in Counselor Interpersonal Power Base Preference

According to Strong and Matross (1973), a counselor's main sources of influencing the client's behaviors are expert, referent, and legitimate power bases. Strong and Matross contend that developing and appropriately using power bases are essential, as influence attempts are successful only if the client perceives the counselor as having resources relevant to their specific needs. Thus it is important for counselors to be skilled in the usage of these different power bases. However there has been relatively little research in counselors' ability to use and preference for differential usage of these power bases.

Robyak (1981) contends that although the factors that determine counselor preference for power bases has largely been ignored in the literature, it can be argued that counselors in training develop (through trial and error) a stable yet individualistic sense of the ways each power base works with each particular client. Thus, preferences may emerge that characterize the counselor's influence style, and this may subsequently affect the counselor's future choice of influence methods. Thus, it would seem important to examine different factors that may account for a counselor's development of power base preference, specifically through the course of training.

The only studies done in this area have been by Robyak (Robyak, 1981; Robyak, Goodyear, Prange, & Donham, 1986) and have examined endorsement of these three power bases in a paper and pencil format. It was hypothesized that power base preference would be related to counselor gender and experience level. Specifically, it was argued that female counselors would be more likely to prefer the legitimate power base (i.e., genuineness, sincerity and warmth), while male counselors would prefer the expert power base (i.e., knowledgeability, rationality and confidence), in keeping with sex role differences. Robyak (1981) found support for this gender difference but it was not replicated in the Robyak et al. (1986) study. This lack of replication was attributed to changes in perceptions of gender-related interpersonal behavior during the intervening years.

Robyak et al. (1986) hypothesized that power base preference would also be related to training level, with more novice counselors

preferring the expert power base less than the other power bases as they may be less prone to perceive themselves as expert and thus may have difficulty adopting this power base. The results of Robyak et al. support this hypothesis indicating that the expert power base is a difficult one for novice counselors to use and that with more experience, they feel more comfortable with it.

The other variable examined by Robyak et al. with respect to power base preference was client problem type. Given that Strong and Matross (1973) view it as important to adopt different power bases depending upon the specific client, the ability of counselors to adopt different power bases across different client problems was assessed; specifically, if presented with a description of a depressed client and an anxious client, would counselors prefer different power bases. However, they found no difference in power base preference across the different types of clients.

In sum, the studies of Robyak present an interesting yet far from clear picture regarding the preference of power bases. One of the problems with the research is with the definition and assessment of power base preference. Both Robyak studies had the subjects read a paragraph describing each of the 3 power bases, and then the subject would indicate on a single item the extent to which they would use each power base. Beyond the issue of the unreliability of 1 item scales, having subjects respond to a whole paragraph containing many concepts yields little information on what the basis of the single item rating indicates. Given the psychometric problems of measuring the power bases in this way and the importance of the concept of power base utilization, we thought it important to reexamine the questions posed by Robyak except using a more sound assessment instrument.

We designed an instrument to assess likelihood of endorsement of specific behaviors representing the three power bases. This focus on specific behaviors and not ambiguous, unreliable general descriptions was thought to be an improvement over the past research and hopefully more generalizable to actual counseling as specific behaviors are of concern and not general approaches. The endorsement of specific behaviors representing the three power bases were examined as they varied across the same variables examined by Robyak (Robyak, 1981; Robyak et al., 1986): counselor gender, counselor experience level, and client problem type. The major departure in this study from that of Robyak (besides more

psychometrically sound measures) was the specific client problem types examined. Whereas Robyak et al. (1986) looked for differences between the relatively similar client problem types of anxiety and depression, we chose more divergent client problems of career indecision and suicidal ideation. As demonstrated by Tracey, Hays, Malone, and Herman (1988), with more severely disturbed clients, trainees respond more similarly than they do with less disturbed clients. Thus, whether or not there would be more differential power base preferences for the more disturbed client was examined.

Lastly, we decided to have participants complete the CRF-S (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975), an instrument that measures the same constructs as the three power bases proposed by Strong and Matross (1973) -- counselor expertness, referentness, and legitimacy. Typically, the CRF-S is completed by clients in evaluating their counselors, and has been found to measure not three constructs but one -- a more global "good guy" factor (Tracey, Glidden & Kokotovic, 1988). However, we felt that trainees, in evaluating their own behavior, might be more sensitive to differences between their usage of these methods of influence in counseling; whereas clients may not make these subtle but important distinctions. Moreover, we wondered if correlating participants' responses on the CRF-S -- general traits-- and the specific situational power base behaviors assessed in this study would yield a high degree of correspondence, in that a counselor's self-assessment of their general trait usage and situational behavior usage should bear at least a moderate relationship.

Method

Sample

Forty students enrolled in an APA approved counseling psychology program at a large midwestern University comprised the sample. This group included 11 males and 29 females. Twenty-three students were classified as "less experienced" (0-2 completed semesters of supervised practicum experience) and 17 students were classified as "more advanced" (beyond 2 completed semesters of supervised practicum experience up to and including internship experience). With respect to racial breakdown, there were 31 whites, 4 African-Americans, 1 Mexican-American, 1 Asian-American, and 3 foreign-born students.

Instruments

Power Base Assessment (PBA) was designed for use in this study and was used to assess counselor preference for the three different power bases (expert, legitimate, and trustworthy) in response to specific client characteristics. The instrument consisted of a client description followed by 15 counselor statements that could be uttered to the client, each representing one of the three power bases. The counselor was requested to endorse, using a seven point scale (1 = very unlikely to use, 7 = very likely to use) the likelihood that he or she would use that response in interacting with the client described. Three separate summed subscales scores of five items each were yielded representing the likelihood of usage of the three power bases.

The specific items included in the PBA were selected after distributing an earlier version of the PBA containing 30 items to 8 first-year counseling psychology graduate students. These students were not included in the actual study's sample. The students were given descriptions of the separate power bases and asked to rate each item on a seven point scale (1=not at all, to 7=very much) for the extent to which each item reflected each of the power bases. For each power base, the items were ranked in terms of discriminating how representative the item was for a particular power base (over the two other power bases). The items chosen typically contained a mean rating for one power base between 5.0 and 7.0, with the mean rating of the other two power bases below 4.0. Thus the 5 best discriminating items for each separate power base were chosen; 15 items were chosen in all.

There were two separate client descriptions used as stimuli in guiding counselor responses on the PBA. The two client descriptions were identical in describing a college female who was coming into a counseling center; the only difference was the distress reflected in the presenting problem. One client was described as having suicidal ideation, while the other was concerned with career indecisiveness. All other aspects of the descriptions were identical. Respondents were instructed to read the client description and imagine meeting with this client in the middle stages of counseling when responding to the PBA items.

On the current sample of 40, internal consistencies were calculated for each of the three PBA scales across the two separate client descriptions. For the career indecision client, alpha's of .73, .53, and .56 were obtained for the expert, referent, and legitimate subscales, respectively. For the suicidal ideation client, alphas of .54, .48, and .57 were obtained for the same three respective subscales.

Counselor Rating Form-Short (CRF-S, Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983) is a shortened version of the CRF (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975) and consists of 12 adjectives assessing perception of the counselor which are responded to using a 7 point format. The CRF-S yields subscale scores for the three power bases of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Corrigan and Schmidt have demonstrated sound reliability and validity for the instrument . However, Tracey, Glidden and Kokotovic (1988) have demonstrated that though the CRF-S assesses the unique aspects of the three power bases, it predominantly is indicative of a general positive evaluation.

The CRF-S is typically used to assess client reactions to counselor power bases, however as used in this study, the CRF-S was used to obtain a self assessment of the counselor of his or her characteristic power base utilization. Thus the CRF-S was used to get an indication of general stable self perceptions of power base utilization, unlike the client specific power base utilization assessed above.

Procedures

Questionnaire packets containing a cover letter describing the research, the CRF-S, and the two PBA's (one with each client description presented in random order) were mailed to 56 students enrolled in an APA approved counseling psychology program in the midwest. The respondents were all assured that their cooperation was voluntary and that their responses would be anonymous. Forty-three students returned the materials for a 77% response rate.

As a check on the validity of the responses, two items were included in the PBA, one requesting that the respondent report the presenting problem of the stimulus client and one requesting that the respondents rate (on a 7 point scale from not very well to very well) the extent to which they could place themselves in the counselor role for the task. Three respondents reported presenting problems different from those listed in the stimulus and were thus

discarded, resulting in a final sample of 40. The mean for the item regarding ability to place oneself in the role of the counselor was 4.95 (SD= 1.01), indicating that the final sample of 40 respondents perceived themselves as appropriately in role during the task.

Results

A three-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was employed to examine differences in the PBA subscales across level of experience, gender, and presenting problem, with experience level and gender being between subject factors and problem type being a within subject factor. The means and standard deviations for each of the PBA subscale scores across the conditions are reported in Table 1 and the results of the MANOVA are summarized in Table 2.

Insert Table 1 About Here

Insert Table 2 About Here

The results of the MANOVA were not significant for gender, level of experience, nor any of the interactions. Only the within subjects factor of problem type was found to attain significance. Post-hoc ANOVA's on the problem type effect were found to be significant for the expert ($F(1,38)= 7.20$, $p<.01$) and the legitimate ($F(1,38)= 7.84$, $p<.01$) power base subscales but not for the referent subscale ($F(1,38)= 0.34$, $p>.05$). Trainees demonstrated a greater utilization of the expert power base with the career indecision client than with the suicidal client, while the opposite pattern was true for the legitimate power base.

Given that level of experience is often a difficult concept to operationalize (Stein & Lambert, 1984), two other methods of dichotomizing the sample along experience lines were examined to ensure that the lack of difference associated with experience was accurate and not necessarily reflective of the specific manner of dividing the sample. The first method used was to dichotomize the

sample using highest degree obtained (bachelor's versus master's). The distinction is the same method used by Robyak et al. (1986). The second method was to dichotomize the sample using the 150 direct client contact hours as a cutoff. This cutoff was selected as it is the minimum requirement necessary in applying for internship. The results of the MANOVA's conducted using these two alternative definitions of experience were identical to the one listed above. The PBA scores were not related to level of experience, however defined, singly or in interaction with the other variables.

Insert Table 3 About Here

Finally, to examine the extent to which situational endorsement of power base usage is similar to general endorsement of one's own style of power base usage, the PBA subscales across the two client stimuli were correlated with the CRF-S. These correlations are listed in Table 3. Even though a liberal individual alpha test of .05 is used, none of the correlations listed in Table 3 attained significance, indicating that there was no relation between specific power base responses given to specific clients and perceived global power base traits as assessed by the CRF-S.

Discussion

The results of the study indicate that counselors did not vary in their endorsement of the different power bases as a function of gender or level of experience, however there was support for differential usage of the power bases depending upon the specific client being used as a stimulus. The lack of a gender effect in this study and that in Robyak et al. (1986) lead us to question the value of gender in the endorsement of power bases. Further, the present study suggests that regardless of how experience level is defined (three fairly different methods were used) there was no relation with power base endorsement. This result conflicts with the differences found by Robyak et al. (1986). However given the focus in this study on specific behaviors and on a less ambiguous and more reliable measure, we think more faith should be placed in these results. There does not appear to be a relation of experience level

(at least as it varies within graduate training) and power base endorsement.

The differential power base endorsement across problem type is important and is supportive of the theory proposed by Strong and Matross. They claim that for counselors to be effective, they must vary power base usage in accordance with a client's tacit and differential preference for these three power bases. Thus differential application of power bases is necessary. Given the two very different clients described in this study (one concerned with career indecisiveness and the other with suicide), the counselors demonstrated strong differential preferences for the expert and legitimate power bases. The legitimate power base was endorsed more with the suicidal client than with the career indecision client, while the opposite pattern was demonstrated for the expert power base; lower levels were endorsed for the suicidal client and higher levels for the career indecision. Two possible interpretations of this differential result suggest themselves. One may be that given the potential consequences of suicidal ideation, counselors-in-training may be more wary to adopt an expert power base. Another is that counselors view the expert power base as more appropriate and effective with someone with career indecision; while the legitimate power base may seem less appropriate for career clients and extremely appropriate for suicidal clients.

The lack of relation between the specific power base behaviors assessed by the PBA and the more general, global self evaluation of power bases as approximated by using the CRF-S indicates that general endorsement may have little to do with what power bases one actually are used. This result calls into question the validity the results of Robyak (1981) and Robyak et al. (1986) as they relied on very global assessments of power base. Further, given the focus on specific power base behaviors, we hope that the translation to actual in session behavior may be better. The PBA, constructed for this study, may serve as a useful instrument for future studies examining counselor differential power base preference.

This study is an analogue study using a paper and pencil format and subsequent research must be conducted on examining the generalizability of these results to actual counseling. However the differential usage of power bases across problem type is an important result, supportive of Strong and Matross' (1973) theory. More work in the area of differential responsiveness using power

bases to different clients is needed. As the differential usage is further understood, the effectiveness of this differential usage can be examined.

References

Barak, A., & LaCrosse, N. E. (1975). Multidimensional perception of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 471-476.

Corrigan, J. D., & Schmidt, L. A. (1983). Development and validation of revisions in the Counselor Rating Form. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 64-74.

Robyak, J. E. (1981). Effects of gender on the counselor's preference for methods of influence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 7-12.

Robyak, J. E., Goodyear, R. K., Prange, M. E., & Donham, G. (1986). Effects of gender, supervision, and presenting problems on practicum students' preference for interpersonal power bases. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33, 159-163.

Stein, D. M., & Lambert, M. J. (1984). On the relationship between therapist experience and psychotherapy outcome. Clinical Psychology Review, 4, 127-142.

Strong, S. R., & Matross, R. P. (1973). Change processes in counseling and psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, 25-32.

Tracey, T. J., Glidden, C. E., & Kokotovic, A. M. (1988). Factor structure of the Counselor Rating Form-Short. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35, 330-335.

Tracey, T. J., Hays, K. A., Malone, J., & Herman, B. (1988). Changes in counselor response as a function of experience. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35, 119-126.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for PBA Subscales

		Expert		Referent		Legitimate	
Variable	N	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Level of Experience							
Less Exp'd	23	18.65	4.71	14.20	3.88	21.70	3.78
More Adv'd	17	19.71	6.00	14.41	4.77	22.47	6.38
Gender							
Males	11	19.27	4.68	15.14	3.59	20.77	4.44
Females	29	19.03	5.54	13.97	4.47	22.50	5.19
Client Problem							
Career Indec.	40	20.65	5.53	14.00	4.44	20.50	4.74
Suic. Ideation	40	17.55	4.60	14.57	4.09	23.55	4.90

Table 2

Summary of the MANOVA on PBA Subscales as a Function of Gender, Experience, and Problem Type.

Source	df	MS	F	p
Level of Experience (A)	3,79	77.75	1.92	.17
Problem Type (B)	2,160	826.11	53.33	.00
Gender (C)	3,79	0.02	0.00	.98
A x B	6,79	7.59	0.49	.61
A x C	6,79	86.60	2.14	.15
B x C	6,79	32.95	2.13	.12
A x B x C	9,79	4.78	0.31	.74

Table 3

Correlations between PBA Subscales and CRF-S Subscales

	CRF-S Subscale		
PBA Subscale	Expertness	Attractiveness	Trustworthiness
Career Indecision			
Expert	.28	.22	.26
Referent	-.11	.27	.01
Legitimate	-.01	.04	.27
Suicidal Ideation			
Expert	.09	.14	.20
Referent	-.16	.16	.00
Legitimate	.08	-.20	.01